DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 064 SP 027 388

AUTHOR Marso, Ronald N.; Pigge, Fred L.
TITLE Beginning Teachers: Expectations vs. Realities.
PUB DATE 3 Mar 86
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (San Francisco, CA, March 1-4, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Discipline; Elementary Secondary Education; Parent Teacher Cooperation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Conditions; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent that 24 working conditions impacted upon the reality shock of four groups (N=211) of beginning teachers (elementary, secondary, specialized, and special education) who were teaching in three types of schools (rural, urban, and suburban). For only two working conditions were the teachers' reality ratings more positive than their expectations: help from other teachers and teaching being observed by administrators. The beginning secondary teachers experienced more reality shock than did the elementary teachers; teachers employed by urban schools reported much more reality shock than those employed by rural or suburban schools. Suburban teachers appeared to be more disappointed with the rapport, support, and respect of parents; secondary teachers were more disappointed by conferences; and specialized area teachers were more disappointed with the behavior of students. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267064

Beginning Teachers: Expectations vs. Realities

Ronald N. Marso
Fred L. Pigge
Bowling Green State University

A Paper Presented at the
41st Annual Conference Program
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
San Francisco, California
March 1-4, 1986

(Session 4203, March 3, 1986)

SP027388

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Marso
T. Pigge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent that 24 working conditions impacted upon the reality shock of four groups (N = 211) of beginning teachers (elementary, secondary, specialized, and special education) who were teaching in three types of schools (rural, urban, and suburban). For only two working conditions were the teachers' reality ratings more positive than their expectations: help from other teachers and teaching being observed by administrators. The beginning secondary teachers experienced more reality shock than did the elementary teachers; teachers employed by urban schools reported much more reality shock than those employed by rural or suburban schools. Suburban teachers appeared to be more disappointed with the rapport and respect of students; special education teachers were more disappointed with the rapport, support, and respect of parents; secondary teachers were more disappointed by the support from other teachers and administrators and parent-teacher conferences; and specialized area teachers were more disappointed with the behavior of students.

Beginning Teachers: Expectations vs. Realities

The transition from student to first-year teacher is traumatic for many and is frequently labeled "transition shock" or "reality shock." Symptoms of this reality shock addressed by researchers have included the identification of typical problems experienced, changes in teaching behavior, shifts in attitudes, changes in personality, and intention to or actually leaving the profession. Hypothesized causes of reality shock encompass personal attributes, professional training inadequacies, and job situational factors (Veenman, 1984). Improper attitudes, unsuitable personality traits, limited capabilities, critical life transition (student to adult, establishing new home and friends, etc.), unrealistic beliefs about teaching, and incorrect career choice have been presented as some common personal contributing factors or causes. Insufficient training, too limited field-type experiences, and substandard selection criteria have been posed as major preparation associated causes of reality shock. School or job situations contributing to the reality shock phenomenon of beginning teachers are characterized by the following: limited administrative support, shortages of instructional materials and equipment, lack of clarity in educational objectives, the cellular isolation of individual classroom social units, teacher role complexity, multiple and conflicting demands on the teacher role, assignment of new staff to more difficult and less desirable classes, responsibilities for subjects in areas of limited training, and overly large classes with limited time for planning.

Theoretical Perspectives

Reality shock has been analyzed from several theoretical perspectives. Fuller (1975) addressed this phenomenon through her empirically-constructed theory of teacher development wherein teaching evolves through a series of concern phases from self-survival concerns, situational (task) concerns, and lastly to concerns of impact upon students. A central thesis of this theory is that appropriately addressing these concerns during preservice and early inservice training should reduce reality shock while increasing feelings of adequacy. Lortie (1975) studied the problems of beginning teachers and

associated reality shock from a social-cultural analytical framework. He concluded that the teaching profession, itself, lacks a codified body of knowledge and skills which is further complicated by a transition into the profession that is best characterized as sudden. He further concluded that learning by doing is seen by the profession as the most important aspect of professional development and that socialization to the role of teacher results primarily from the thousands of hours of being a pupil. From this thinking it is concluded that teacher training is viewed as having very little impact on the teaching role. Further complications leading to reality shock from the social-cultural perspective arise from the complex and multiple demands placed on the teacher role in an unsupportive and unrewarding cultural context which, of course, extends through and beyond the transition period.

Others have viewed teacher development from a cognitive framework in which the teacher is viewed as an adult learner with significant mediating cognitive processes varying by age and stage of development (Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). From this perspective, teachers at later stages of cognitive development respond better to needs of others, perceive classroom problems more broadly, tend to be more flexible and more stress tolerant, use a greater variety of teaching strategies, and are more able to understand and empathize with students. In brief, beginning teachers at different stages of cognitive development are likely to perceive and to respond to classroom settings in different ways.

Problems of Beginning Teachers

Veenman (1984) has provided a recent, major review of the research on beginning teachers which provides insight into the scope and nature of the reality shock phenomenon. He gained an international perspective of this research through selecting and reviewing 83 empirical studies conducted in several countries over the past two decades. The most frequently reported or observed problems of beginning teachers from these studies were ranked as follows: (a) classroom discipline (by far the most serious problem), (b) motivating students, (c) dealing with individual differences, (d) assessing student work, (e) relationships with parents, (f) organization of class work, (g) insufficient materials and supplies, and (h) dealing with problems of individual students. Little differences were found between problems reported by elementary and secondary teachers, by decade in which the research was conducted, by first year or subsequent year(s) of teaching experience, by country in which the study was conducted, or by institution or nature of teacher training program. Within these variations the relative frequency rank among the problems changed somewhat, but the types of problems identified tended to remain the same. He, therefore, concluded that the problems of beginning teachers appear not to be attributable solely to personal-individual characteristics, to situational characteristics of the work place, or to the nature of the teacher training program.

Harrison and Westerman (1974) similarly found that the seven most frequently identified problems of inexperienced teachers were identical to those of more experienced teachers, but the relative ranking in frequency among these seven problems varied somewhat between the two groups. Bruner and Felder (1983) found that many of the reported problems of secondary teachers could be addressed by administrators (i.e., amount of administrative support, school security, and burdensome administrative paperwork). Adams (1982) reported that

administrative and parent concerns appeared to increase with years of teaching experience while problems of highest concern (discipline and motivation) did not tend to change over the first five years of teaching experience. He also noted that a contributing factor to the first year reality shock may be that many new teachers are assigned to more difficult and less desirable classes.

New teachers are adamant in stating that their college courses were too theoretical and too impractical while commending the value of realistic field experiences in their training (Applegate & Lasley, 1985; Metzner, Nelson, & Sharp, 1972; Pigge, 1978). Yet, the results of more qualitative approaches to research of problems of new teachers (Childers & Podemski, 1982-83; Gibson, 1976; Lasley, 1980; O'Rourke, 1983) suggest that the new teachers feel that their own initial expectations also contributed to their reality shock. New teachers frequently report that they expected too much of themselves (exemplified by these types of beliefs: I will be able to reach all students. I will not be boring like many of my own teachers. I will be a friend to and like all my students. My own enthusiasm for my subject will be contagious to students.), of their students (Students will be motivated by good lessons. All kids are reachable. Students will appreciate and recognize my extra work and efforts. Students will like and respect me. Kids respond better to trust and acceptance than to management.), and too much of teaching (Teaching is a rewarding experience. We teach students not subjects. Teachers are highly regarded. Teachers have a lot of extra time for family and friends. Teaching is an intellectual challenge. If I know my subject well I will be a good teacher.). High expectations and concern about practical job readiness upon entering a profession long planned and prepared for, in itself, is not unique to teachers. Further, as suggested by Pajak and Black (1982), some initial job entry reality shock might be considered normal and may even be a desired impetus to the development of a professional self in the first and later years of experience.

Review Conclusions

Even a preliminary review of the research and theoretical literature addressing the reality shock experienced by beginning teachers suggests clearly that many factors contribute to the problem. A successful training-induction-mentoring program designed to reduce reality shock will likely have to address (a) the cultural-social support systems of the employing school including appropriate initial class assignment, (b) the life transition needs of the beginning teacher (transition from a student to adult, lost friendships, new personal responsibilities, etc.), (c) the development of a successful mentor relationship, and (d) the provision of field-job orienting experiences including experiences designed to modify and develop a positive but realistic attitude-belief system related to teaching, the profession, and students. Criticisms of or programs addressing only the liberalizing effects of higher education, only the inadequateness of teacher training, only unrealistic beliefs, only the inadequacies of the public schools, only the quality of teacher candidates, or only the mentor-student relationship would appear too limited in scope to fully alleviate the problem of reality shock of beginning teachers.

Problem and Hypotheses

One of the major limitations of the existing research literature noted by Veenman (1984) was that few studies specifically addressed the possible relationships between job related conditions and problems leading to reality shock. The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent that 24 working conditions or job situational factors impacted upon the reality shock of four groups of beginning teachers (elementary, secondary, specialized, and special education) who were teaching in three types of schools (rural, urban, and suburban). The general hypothesis was that there would not be a significant difference between the beginning teachers' prior expectations and their on-the-job reality ratings for the various working conditions (e.g., instructional help/advice/guidance from (a) other teachers, (b) administrators or (c) the recently completed teacher-training program; rapport with and respect of others; workload; pupil behavior; physical facilities; budgetary support; etc.).

Method

As part of an indepth Bowling Green State University spring 1985 follow-up of its recent teacher-education graduates, a total of 406 1983 and 1984 graduates who were about to complete their first or second year of full-time teaching in Ohio were asked to respond to the 24 items which comprised the survey instrument for this study. A total of 211 (52%) useable questionnaires were returned by this group of beginning teachers of whom 97 described their employing school as being rural, 91 as suburban, 19 as urban, and four failed to classify their school. Relative to teaching field, 72 reported their teacher-education program as well as their present teaching assignment to be in special education, 61 in elementary education, 45 in the specialized areas (art, music, home economics, physical education, etc.), and 33 in the content subjects of secondary education. Another important characteristic of this sample is that each of these individuals had completed the expanded field experiences mandated by the State of Ohio in 1975 (300 clock hours of field and clinical experiences required for each teacher-education major, regardless of program).

The survey was sent by mail to each graduate at his/her employing school building and included a statement of confidentiality and a stamped return envelope. Nonrespondents were mailed reminders three weeks after the original mailing. Specific to this study, the beginning teachers were asked to denote their prior expectation and their on-the-job reality ratings for 24 working conditions via a five-point Likert-type scale. The instructions, the response code, and example item number 17 for the instrument follow. The entire list of 24 items as printed on the survey form are presented on Table 1.

> PRIOR EXPECTATIONS AND ON-THE-JOB REALITIES
> Near the end of your college career you probably had some preconceived notions or expectations of the working conditions you would experience as a full-time teacher. The purpose of this section is to determine the difference, if any, between what you expected and what you found.

Please circle the response for your "prior expectations" on the left, your "on-the-job realities" on the right. Response Code:

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Negative	Negative	Average or No Opinion	Positive	Highly Positive

1 2 3 4 5 17. Parent-teacher conferences 1 2 3 4 5

The "expectation" and "reality" means were computed for the total group (N = 211) and for each of the seven subgroups of beginning teachers (four teaching fields and three types of schools). In addition, item mean discrepancies (difference between expectation and reality ratings) were analyzed for statistical significance and were rank ordered for each of the seven subgroups.

Results

A listing of the 24 items which comprised the instrument as well as the expectation (prior) and on-the-job reality (job) rating means for the elementary, secondary, special education, and specialized teachers are presented in Table 1. In addition, the probability values associated with the dependent t-tests used to ascertain whether there were significant differences between each set of expectation and reality means for these four groups of teachers are presented in this table. It may be observed from this data that each teaching group had a higher total (sum of all 24 items) expectation than reality mean. Three of the mean differences are significant at $p < .001$ and one (elementary) significant at the .03 level. Similar data but for the rural, suburban, urban, and the total groups of teachers are presented in Table 2. Each of these sample subgroupings reveal total expectation means significantly greater ($p < .001$) than its reality mean. Thus, the general hypothesis of no difference between the prior expectation and on-the-job reality ratings of the beginning teachers was rejected.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Highest and lowest expectations and realities. The four highest reported prior expectations for the total sample were: feelings of accomplishment (item 20), rapport with and respect of other teachers (item 7), level of job satisfaction (item 24), and rapport with and respect of students (item 5). The four highest on-the-job realities were: instructional help/guidance/advice from other teachers (items 7, 5, and 1), and rapport with and respect of administrators/supervisors/department heads (item 8).

The two lowest reported expectations (ranks of 23 and 24) for the total group of teachers were also the two lowest on-the-job realities, namely: instructional help/guidance/advice from inservice training (item 3), and budgetary support of teaching area (item 10). There was considerable agreement of the expectation and reality mean item rankings for the total sample as described by the Rho of .69 in Table 2. However, the Pearson r of .29 indicates that only approximately 8% (r^2) of the variance of the total reality scores was associated with the variance of the total expectation scores; this suggests that

overall the expectation and reality item responses are relatively independent of one another.

For the total scores of the seven subgroups of teachers, low and mostly positive Pearson correlations were found between the prior expectation and on-the-job reality ratings; the coefficients varied between .23 and .42 on the combined 24 item scale for the seven subgroups with the exception of the secondary teacher subgroup which had a coefficient of -.01 (see Tables 1 and 2). The coefficients between expectations and reality ratings for the total group for each of the 24 individual items varied from -.09 to +.48 with all but six showing a positive direction. The -.09 coefficient was associated with item 16 (Equipment for my teaching area) and the +.48 was for item 9 (Rapport with and respect of community members).

The examination of subgroup means for the combined 24 items (see "Totals" line in Tables 1 and 2) suggests differences in the relative amounts of reality shock that was experienced by the different teachers. It would appear that the differences among the subgroups cannot be explained solely in terms of prior expectations because the expectation subgroup means were more similar than were the reality means and the rather low correlations between the expectation and reality ratings imply a high degree of independence between the two measures. The beginning secondary teachers in the sample experienced more reality shock (mean difference of -11.94) than did the beginning elementary teachers (mean difference of -4.16); teachers employed by urban schools reported much more reality shock (mean difference of -15.42) than those employed by rural or suburban schools (mean differences of -7.74 and -7.32, respectively). Special education and specialized teachers' total mean difference scores were -8.71 and -9.80, respectively.

Analysis of the mean discrepancies. The total group of 211 beginning teachers indicated significant reality shocks for 16 of the 24 working conditions. (A reality shock was defined as having occurred when for any working condition an "on-the-job reality" mean was significantly less ($p < .001$) than the "prior-expectation" mean.) An item rank ordering for the total group of teachers by magnitude of the reality minus expectation mean differences is presented in Table 3. Also presented in Table 3 are the mean discrepancies and their respective ranks for the seven subgroups of teachers.

Insert Table 3 about here

For the total group of teachers, the six items (or working conditions) revealing greatest teacher reality shock are respectively: work load, equipment, inservice training, physical facilities, an environment conducive to professional growth, and the help/guidance from the recently completed college programs. The items showing the lowest discrepancies (and little if any true reality shock) for the combined group of teachers are: rapport and respect from other teachers, administrators, students, and community members; parent-teacher conferences; help and advice from administrators and other teachers; and being observed by administrators.

When teacher responses on individual items were reviewed by type of school or teaching area, considerable agreement in relative ranking of the

discrepancies between expectation and reality ratings was found. Of the top six ranked items (for the total group) all were ranked in the top 11 of each of the seven subgroup rankings with the exception of the response of the urban teachers to item three (help and advice from inservice training) which had a rank of 18. This was the only subgroup discrepancy among these top ranked six items that was not sufficiently large to be significant at $p \leq .05$ (see Tables 1 and 2). Thus, it appears that all subgroups of teachers except the urban teachers expected much more of their inservice training than warranted by on-the-job reality. Similarly, Table 3 data show there was considerable agreement among the subgroup rankings for the six items on which the total group showed the least mean discrepancies between expectation and reality ratings. Each of these subgroup discrepancies received rankings between 11 and 24 except for the subgroup rankings for urban and secondary teachers on item 17 (parent-teacher conferences). This item for these two subgroups produced discrepancy ranks of 5.5 and 7, respectively; for each group, the mean difference was significant at $p = .02$ (see Tables 1 and 2). In other words, parent-teacher conferences for these two groups of teachers certainly did not live up to prior expectations.

The review of teacher responses in Table 3 to each individual item by sample subgroup, however, did reveal several discrepancies among relative rankings which lead to the following tentative findings. Relative to type of school (urban, suburban, rural) it appears that: (a) Suburban teachers were more disappointed with the rapport and respect of students. (b) Urban teachers were more disappointed with budget support, job satisfaction, and parent-teacher conferences while less disappointed by inservice training and physical facilities. Relative to teaching field (elementary, secondary, specialized, and special education) it appears that: (a) Special education teachers were more disappointed with the rapport, support, and respect of parents but less disappointed with equipment, facilities, and job satisfaction. (b) Elementary teachers were more disappointed with rapport and respect of students and of other teachers while less disappointed with inservice training. (c) Secondary teachers were more disappointed by the support from other teachers and administrators and parent-teacher conferences while less disappointed with the behavior of students. (d) Specialized area teachers were more disappointed with the behavior of students. The subgroup response differences to many of these individual items may be explained by variations in settings. One might suspect more problems with student behavior among specialized areas (art, music, etc.) where so many students must be worked with on a more limited basis. Urban teachers might be expected to report more problems with budget and parent-teacher conferences. And secondary teachers typically located in larger institutional settings characterized by more cellular class units might be expected to report less support from other teachers and administrators.

It is rather significant to note that only on two items did the total group of teachers reveal an increase rather than a decrease in rating from prior expectations to on-the-job realities. These were on items one (help from other teachers) and 23 (teaching being observed by administrators). Neither of the mean differences for these two items (see Table 2) were sufficiently large to conclude that "reality" was significantly more positive than "expectation" for the total sample of teachers ($p < .001$); however, the positive mean increase from prior to on-the-job ratings for the elementary teacher subgroup on item 23 (see Table 1) was significant. This was the single instance of a positive item mean change from expectations to reality among all comparisons which reached significance at $p < .001$ level. It is interesting to note how the various

subgroups responded numerically to these two items: For help from other teachers (item one), six groups had job means higher than expectations, secondary did not; for teaching being observed (item 23), five groups had higher job means, specialized and urban teachers did not.

Discussion

Reality shock appeared to be evident for this sample of beginning teachers despite the fact that these teachers had completed an extensive, mandated 300 clock hour preservice clinical and field experience requirement. Sixteen of the 24 working conditions identified on the survey form revealed significant reality shock for the total group of teachers. This result would appear to lend support to the contention of Veenman (1984) and others who suggest that it is more than a lack of prior field experiences or any other single factor underlying the reality shock phenomenon of beginning teachers.

This group of new teachers, however, revealed that they had realistic prior expectations for several work-related conditions. In this regard, help from others (teachers, administrators, and supervisors), rapport with and respect of others (teachers, administrators, and community members), and parent-teacher conferences appeared to contribute very little if any to the reality shock of these beginning teachers. In general, these new teachers had very realistic prior expectations of working conditions associated with administrators and other teachers (help and advice, rapport and respect, support and encouragement, and being observed by administrators). This suggests, at least relative to contributions of experienced teacher and administrator to the successful transition of students into the teaching profession, that mentor-induction programs would likely be beneficial. Relatedly, the high negative discrepancy for the two items related to inservice training and environment conducive to professional growth would suggest the need for some organized efforts toward mentor-induction programs to counteract these discrepancies. It would appear necessary, however, to caution those designing mentor-induction programs to note that the factor most contributing to the reality shock of these beginning teachers was the job's work and time demands. Thus, mentor-induction programs that markedly add to the work and time demands of beginning teachers might be counter productive.

The more intense problems reported by previous beginning teachers (Veenman, 1984), e.g., classroom discipline, motivating students, job satisfaction, etc., appear to have been only minor or moderate problems for this group of new teachers. This dissimilarity in the rankings of selected problem areas in this study compared to previous studies along with reported good interpersonal relationships with students, other teachers and administrators may suggest a moderately successful professional entrance for this sample of students despite their overly optimistic prior expectations about workloads, equipment, physical facilities, etc. These latter problems may well be less threatening to a successful transition into the profession and more amenable to expanded and structured classroom exercises and/or field experiences during training. Conversely, these differences may reflect no real change in beginning teacher problems but are merely an artifact of the different way the teachers were asked to report on reality shock in this study.

The responses of this sample do indicate that the beginning elementary teachers experienced less reality shock than did the secondary teachers and that

those teachers employed by urban schools experience more reality shock than those employed by rural or suburban schools. The data obtained, however, provided little insight into whether these differences were due to differences demanded of teachers at these levels, to the differing demands of different types of schools and their constituencies, to lack of preparation for different types of schools, to the personal differences of individuals seeking or accepting different employments, to differing facilitative support provided by different types of schools, subject or grade levels, or to some combination thereof.

References

Adams, R. D. (1982). Teacher development: A look at changes in teacher perceptions and behavior across time. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4), 40-43.

Applegate, J. H., & Lasley, T. J. (1985). Students' expectations for early field experience. Texas Tech Journal of Education, 12(1), 27-36.

Childers, J. H., Jr., & Podemski, R. S. (1982-83). Confronting idealistic teacher expectations: Strategies for training programs and school districts. Teacher Educator, 18(3), 2-10.

Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education (Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibson, R. (1976). The effect of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 2(3), 241-250.

Harrison, A., Jr., & Westerman, J. E. (1974). Teacher problems: Perceptions vs. reality. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 7(2), 34-46.

Lasley, T. J. (1980). Preservice teacher beliefs about teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 38-41.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Metzner, S., Nelson, W. A., & Sharp, R. M. (1972). On-site teaching: Antidote for reality shock. Journal of Teacher Education, 23(2), 194-198.

O'Rourke, B. (1983). "Lion tamers and baby sitters": First-year English teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate teacher preparation. English Education, 15(1), 17-25.

Pajak, E. F., & Blase, J. J. (1982). Teaching, the loss of innocence, and the psychological development of a professional self. Educational Horizons, 60(2), 65-72.

Pigge, F. L. (1978). Teacher competencies: Need, proficiency, and where proficiency was developed. Journal of Teacher Education, 29(4), 70-76.

Sprinthall, N. A., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner: A cognitive-developmental view. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), Staff development (Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Table 1

Means of Ratings by Teaching Field Subgroups

Item	Elementary (61)			Secondary (33)			Spec. Educ. (72)			Specialized (45)		
	Prior	Job	p†	Prior	Job	p†	Prior	Job	p†	Prior	Job	p†
Instructional help/ guidance/advice from												
1. Other teachers	4.05	4.41	.03	4.27	4.27	.99	3.99	4.08	.52	4.16	4.29	.49
2. Administrators/ supervisors/depart-ment heads	4.07	4.03	.84	3.82	3.76	.85	3.97	3.68	.10	4.02	3.78	.21
3. Inservice training	3.51	3.18	.04	3.55	2.45	.00	3.70	3.17	.00	3.73	2.89	.00
4. College course work/ experiences	4.00	3.62	.00	4.18	3.39	.00	4.17	3.53	.00	4.07	3.66	.01
Rapport with and respect of												
5. Students	4.43	4.44	.86	4.13	4.28	.50	4.24	3.92	.01	4.31	3.87	.00
6. Parents of students	4.15	4.07	.51	3.91	3.63	.22	4.01	3.40	.00	4.09	3.89	.19
7. Other teachers	4.33	4.56	.04	4.25	4.22	.88	4.31	4.18	.28	4.39	4.20	.25
8. Administrators/ supervisors/depart-ment heads	4.17	4.30	.23	3.84	3.84	.99	4.14	3.89	.06	4.27	3.93	.05
9. Community members	3.89	3.91	.87	3.41	3.22	.40	3.65	3.41	.01	3.98	3.84	.26
10. Budgetary support for my teaching area	3.62	3.10	.00	3.67	3.06	.05	3.51	3.17	.06	3.55	3.27	.26
Support (and encouragement) of my teaching area from												
11. Parents	3.92	3.92	.99	3.97	3.55	.03	3.89	3.24	.00	3.89	3.60	.05
12. Other teachers	4.21	4.30	.55	4.36	3.79	.00	4.06	3.74	.04	3.93	3.62	.05
13. Administrators	4.23	4.25	.89	4.30	3.73	.04	3.99	3.68	.05	3.98	3.71	.17
14. Community members	3.69	3.54	.16	3.55	3.09	.01	3.55	3.23	.01	3.84	3.59	.08
15. Physical facilities for my teaching area	4.14	3.53	.00	4.00	3.03	.00	3.68	3.32	.05	4.02	3.24	.00
16. Equipment for my teaching area	4.15	3.36	.00	3.91	2.91	.00	3.74	3.30	.02	3.98	3.27	.00
17. Parent-teacher conferences	3.80	3.87	.73	3.72	3.00	.02	3.62	3.52	.57	3.52	3.36	.43

(table continues)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item	Elementary (61) Prior	Job	p†	Secondary (33) Prior	Job	p†	Spec. Educ. (72) Prior	Job	p†	Specialized (45) Prior	Job	p†
18. Scheduling of classes (for class time) to complete desired objectives	4.03	3.51	.00	3.91	3.36	.00	3.70	3.25	.00	3.91	3.51	.01
19. An environment that is conducive to professional growth and development	4.26	3.90	.01	4.03	3.33	.01	4.11	3.41	.00	4.04	3.40	.00
20. Feelings of accomplishment	4.44	4.21	.09	4.27	3.55	.01	4.22	3.74	.00	4.38	3.73	.00
21. Work load (time, energy-needed, numbers of pupils, classes, number of preparations, etc.	3.97	3.39	.00	3.67	2.70	.00	3.86	3.13	.00	4.13	3.40	.00
22. Behavior of pupils	3.89	3.62	.08	3.64	3.21	.07	3.76	3.23	.00	3.91	3.16	.00
23. My teaching being observed by administrator(s)	3.89	4.28	.00	3.64	3.79	.65	3.66	3.79	.42	3.96	3.69	.15
24. Level of job satisfaction	4.39	4.05	.01	4.30	3.76	.02	4.18	3.93	.03	4.36	3.73	.00
Totals:	96.80	92.64	.03	94.18	82.24	.00	92.26	83.56	.00	95.89	86.09	.00
r*	.31 ($p < .02$)			-.01 (NS)			.29 ($p < .02$)			.42 ($p < .01$)		
Rho*	.62 ($p < .01$)			.56 ($p < .01$)			.66 ($p < .01$)			.69 ($p < .01$)		

*Pearson r's were computed on teachers' total scores (N's varied from 33 to 72); Spearman Rho's were computed from prior and job ranks of the means for the 24 items.

†p values of .00 are to be interpreted as "<.001."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Means of Ratings by Type of Employing School

	Rural (97)			Suburban (91)			Urban (19)			Total (211)		
Item	Prior	Job	p†	Prior	Job	p†	Prior	Job	p†	Prior	Job	p†
1. Help other teachers	4.07	4.16	.49	4.09	4.31	.06	4.11	4.42	.25	4.09	4.25	.05
2. Help administrators	4.02	3.73	.04	3.93	3.99	.71	3.95	3.37	.19	3.99	3.82	.08
3. Help inservice	3.69	3.00	.00	3.57	2.96	.00	3.53	3.11	.10	3.63	3.00	.00
4. Help college classes	4.08	3.62	.00	4.11	3.56	.00	4.16	3.21	.00	4.10	3.56	.00
5. Rapport students	4.28	4.07	.06	4.29	4.21	.42	4.26	3.84	.13	4.29	4.11	.01
6. Rapport parents	4.07	3.79	.02	3.97	3.73	.05	4.22	3.28	.01	4.05	3.73	.00
7. Rapport other teachers	4.32	4.29	.74	4.30	4.33	.77	4.32	4.21	.61	4.32	4.30	.78
8. Rapport administrators	4.14	4.00	.20	4.11	4.12	.93	4.11	3.39	.06	4.13	4.01	.13
9. Rapport community	3.68	3.58	.31	3.78	3.64	.13	3.75	3.38	.05	3.75	3.61	.03
10. Budget for teaching	3.62	3.24	.01	3.50	3.16	.03	3.78	2.56	.00	3.57	3.15	.00
11. Support parents	3.86	3.66	.10	3.96	3.51	.00	3.94	3.06	.03	3.91	3.56	.00
12. Support other teachers	4.14	3.84	.02	4.13	3.87	.03	4.00	4.06	.85	4.13	3.88	.00
13. Support administrators	4.10	3.87	.05	4.11	3.91	.13	4.00	3.47	.15	4.10	3.86	.00
14. Support community	3.61	3.40	.03	3.68	3.39	.00	3.53	2.94	.01	3.65	3.38	.00
15. Physical facilities	4.01	3.25	.00	3.88	3.38	.01	3.79	3.05	.03	3.93	3.32	.00
16. Equipment for teaching	4.00	3.24	.00	3.87	3.29	.00	3.94	2.83	.00	3.94	3.25	.00
17. Parent conferences	3.61	3.65	.84	3.65	3.45	.20	3.89	2.95	.02	3.67	3.51	.13
18. Scheduling time	3.91	3.37	.00	3.84	3.49	.00	3.89	3.11	.01	3.88	3.40	.00
19. Environment growth	4.11	3.56	.00	4.13	3.60	.00	4.16	3.05	.00	4.13	3.54	.00
20. Feelings accomplishment	4.30	3.94	.00	4.35	3.80	.00	4.37	3.58	.02	4.33	3.85	.00
21. Work load	3.86	3.25	.00	3.96	3.16	.00	4.05	3.05	.00	3.92	3.20	.00
22. Behavior pupils	3.84	3.38	.00	3.81	3.31	.00	3.68	3.00	.05	3.81	3.33	.00
23. Teaching observed	3.84	3.96	.37	3.76	3.90	.34	3.74	3.68	.86	3.79	3.91	.18
24. Job satisfaction	4.25	3.92	.01	4.35	3.92	.00	4.42	3.84	.04	4.30	3.90	.00
Totals	94.99	87.25	.00	94.20	86.88	.00	94.00	78.58	.00	94.65	86.52	.00
r*	.23 ($p < .03$)			.32 ($p < .01$)			.32 (NS)			.29 ($p < .01$)		
Rho*	.67 ($p < .01$)			.67 ($p < .01$)			.55 ($p < .01$)			.69 ($p < .01$)		

*Pearson r's were computed on teachers' total scores (N's varied from 19 to 211); Spearman Rho's were computed from prior and job ranks of the means for the 24 items.

†p values of .00 are to be interpreted as "<.001."

Table 3

Ranking by Mean Difference Between Expectation and Reality

For the total group, differences between expectation and reality means for the following items were significant at $p < .001$

Item No.	Item Description	Total (211)		By School Type (N)						By Teaching Area (N)							
				Rural (97)		Urban (19)		Suburb. (91)		Elem. (61)		Sec. (33)		Spec.Ed. (71)		Spec. (45)	
		Rank	M*	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M
21	Work load (preparation, class size, etc.)	1	-.72	4	-.61	4	-1.00	1	-.80	3	-.57	3.5	-.97	1	-.73	4	-.73
16	Equipment for my teaching area	2	-.69	1.5	-.76	2.5	-1.11	3	-.57	1	-.79	2	-1.00	10	-.44	5	-.70
3	Help, advice, inservice training	3	-.63	3	-.69	18	-.42	2	-.61	9	-.33	1	-1.09	6	-.54	1	-.84
15	Physical facilities for my teaching area	4	-.62	1.5	-.76	11	-.74	7.5	-.49	2	-.61	3.5	-.97	11	-.35	2	-.78
19	Environment conducive growth	5	-.59	5	-.56	2.5	-1.11	6	-.53	7	-.36	8	-.70	2	-.70	6.5	-.64
4	Help, advice, college courses, etc.	6	-.54	7	-.46	5.5	-.95	4.5	-.56	6	-.38	5	-.79	4	-.64	10	-.41
18	Scheduling of class time for objectives	8	-.48	6	-.54	9.5	-.79	12	-.36	4.5	-.52	12.5	-.55	9	-.45	11	-.40
20	Feelings of accomplishment	8	-.48	10	-.36	9.5	-.79	4.5	-.56	11.5	-.23	6	-.73	8	-.48	6.5	-.64
22	Behavior of pupils	8	-.48	8	-.45	13	-.68	7.5	-.49	10	-.26	15.5	-.42	7	-.53	3	-.76
10	Budgetary support my teaching area	10	-.42	10	-.38	1	-1.22	13	-.33	4.5	-.52	9	-.61	12	-.34	16	-.27
24	Level of job satisfaction	11	-.40	11	-.33	4.5	-.58	10	-.43	8	-.34	12.5	-.55	18	-.25	8	-.62
11	Support, encouragement from parents	12	-.34	18	-.20	8	-.89	9	-.44	22	-.00	15.5	-.42	3	-.65	14	-.29

(table continues)

Item No.	Item Description	Total (211)		By School Type (N)						By Teaching Area (N)							
				Rural (97)		Urban (19)		Suburb. (91)		Elem. (61)		Sec. (33)		Spec.Ed. (71)		Spec. (45)	
		Rank	M*	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M	Rank	M
6	Rapport, respect of parents	13	-.32	14	-.28	7	-.94	16	-.23	15.5	-.08	17	-.28	5	-.61	20	-.20
14	Support, encouragement community	14	-.28	16	-.22	16	-.59	14	-.30	13	-.15	13	-.45	14	-.32	18	-.25
13	Support, encouragement administrators	15	-.25	14	-.24	17	-.53	18.5	-.20	20	+.02	9.5	-.58	16	-.31	16	-.27
12	Support, encouragement other teachers	16	-.24	12.5	-.29	23	+.06	15	-.27	15.5	+.08	9.5	-.58	14	-.32	13	-.31
	Mean differences for the total group for the following items were not significant at $p < .001$																
5	Rapport and respect of students	17	-.18	17	-.21	22	-.42	11	-.08	20	+.02	24	+.16	14	-.32	9	-.44
2	Help, advice from administrators	18	-.17	12.5	-.29	14.5	-.58	22	+.05	18	-.03	19	-.06	17	-.29	19	-.24
17	Parent-teacher conferences	19	-.16	23.5	+.03	5.5	-.95	18.5	-.20	17	+.07	7	-.72	22	-.10	22	-.16
9	Rapport, respect community members	20	-.14	21	-.10	19	-.38	20	-.15	20	+.02	18	-.19	20	-.25	23	-.14
8	Rapport, respect administrators	21	-.12	19	-.14	12	-.72	24	+.01	14	+.13	21.5	.00	19	-.26	12	-.34
7	Rapport, respect other teachers	22	-.02	23.5	-.03	21	-.11	23	+.03	11.5	+.23	20	-.03	21	-.13	21	-.18
23	Teaching being observed by administrators	23	+.12	20	+.11	24	-.05	21	+.14	24	+.39	23	+.15	24	+.13	16	-.27
1	Help, advice other teachers	24	+.17	22	+.09	20	+.32	17	+.22	23	+.36	21.5	.00	23	+.10	24	+.13

*Means were obtained by subtracting expectation from on-the-job reality ratings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE